



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

TB

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,601	01/14/2002	Jeffrey D. Messerly	END-810	8626

27777 7590 06/18/2003
AUDLEY A. CIAMPORCERO JR.
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
ONE JOHNSON & JOHNSON PLAZA
NEW BRUNSWICK, NJ 08933-7003

EXAMINER

JUNG, WILLIAM C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3737

DATE MAILED: 06/18/2003

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/047,601	MESSERLY, JEFFREY D.
	Examiner William Jung	Art Unit 3737

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 January 2002.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 19-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 14 January 2002 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

1. An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by 37 CFR 1.312. To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in a telephone interview with Verne Kreger, Jr. on June 2, 2003.

The application has been amended as follows: There is two claim 24 in Preliminary Amendment filed on May 16, 2003. Mr. Kreger notified over the phone interview regarding claim 24 and has elected to prosecute the first claim 24 and cancel second claim 24.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the

reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

3. Claims 19, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Okada et al* (US 6,056,735).

Claims 19 and 20: Okada et al anticipate all claimed invention in claims 19, 26, and 27.

Okada et al disclose of ultrasound surgical instrument consisting of ultrasound transducer member having proximal and distal end. The clamp member 142 is adjacent to treatment member 141, which is interchangeable (detachable) with various treatment members such as blade (col. 23, line 24 – col. 24, line 40). The ultrasonically actuated blade is attached to the distal end of the transmission member and the proximal end of the blade is attached to vibratory node point and the treatment portion includes ultrasonically actuated motion in a single plane (col. 30, lines 8-54; col. 31, lines 36-54).

Claim 26: In addition, Okada et al's detachable treatment member can be replaced with curved treatment portion as shown in figure 26 (col. 23, lines 5-18).

Claim 27: Furthermore Okada et al show in figure 28 that the structure of the ultrasound surgical instrument includes tubular sheath 111 where the ultrasonic transmission member is positioned within the tubular sheath (col. 23, line 24 – col. 24, line 40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 3737

5. Claim 21-25, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Okada et al* as applied to claims 19 and 27 above, and further in view of *Beaupre* (US 6,283,981).

Okada et al substantially disclose of all claimed invention in claims 21-25, 28, and 29. Beaupre further discloses that ultrasonically actuated blade component such as Okada et al has undesirable torque generated by the treatment portion (col. 2, lines 35-63). Beaupre teaches that the unbalanced torque can be solved with a balance asymmetry positioned as a counter torque. The counter balance reduces the torque at the node or the point of blade attachment at the distal end to zero or close to zero as possible (col. 5, lines 11-51). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply the teachings of Okada et al to the teachings of Beaupre to achieve the claimed inventions.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Manna et al (US 6,036,667), *Smith et al* (US 5,873,873), *Witt et al* (US 6,068,647), *Mastri et al* (US 6,024,750), *Tsonton et al* (US 5,980,510), *Whipple* (US 5,947,984), and *Wright et al* (US 5,897,523)

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William Jung whose telephone number is 703-605-4364. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:30 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marvin Lateef can be reached on 703-305-3256. The fax phone numbers for the

Art Unit: 3737

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-0758 for regular communications and 703-308-0758 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

WA
June 6, 2003



Marvin M. Lateef
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700